

09/672,635

00AB148

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 5, and 21 have been amended herein. A complete listing of claims is found at pages 2-9 of this Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14, and 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tjandrasuwita *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,654) in view of Hicok *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,599,533). It is submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The combination of Tjandrasuwita *et al.* and Hicok *et al.* does not teach or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

In particular, neither Tjandrasuwita *et al.* nor Hicok *et al.* teaches or suggests a video controller for a dual scan display comprising a hardware cursor adapted to selectively overlay a cursor image onto the first and second display portions, as recited in claims 1, 5, and 21. In the Office Action dated November 19, 2002, the Examiner concedes that Tjandrasuwita *et al.* does not disclose a hardware cursor adapted to selectively overlay a cursor image onto the first and second display portions. Accordingly, the Examiner relied on the teachings of Hicok *et al.* to make up for the deficiencies of Tjandrasuwita *et al.*

09/672,635

00AB148

However, Hicok *et al.* merely teaches a hardware cursor which uses an unused portion of Video RAM as cursor memory to store the cursor information; and is implemented in such a way to minimize a number of gates and silicon used for its implementation. There is nothing in Hicok *et al.* which teaches or suggests employing the hardware cursor in a dual scan display, such that the hardware cursor can overlay a cursor image onto the first and second display portions, as required by independent claims 1, 5, and 21 of the present invention.

Simple XY coordinate overlay of a cursor image using line and pixel counters, as taught in Hicok *et al.*, is inadequate for dual scanned displays. A dual scan display is refreshed by scanning top and bottom halves of an image at substantially the same time. The display shares substantially the same timing between the upper and lower halves, but has separate data paths. Thus, cursors for dual screen displays conventionally required a software driver to draw the cursor on the image. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have recognized that a hardware cursor could have been employed onto a dual scan display, as taught by Tjandrasuwita *et al.* Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been successful utilizing the hardware cursor disclosed in Hicok *et al.* with the dual scan display of Tjandrasuwita *et al.* for at least the reasons discussed above.

Thus, for at least the aforementioned reasons, neither Tjandrasuwita *et al.* nor Hicok *et al.*, individually, or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 5, and 21. Claims 2-4, 6-20, and 22-27 respectively depend from claims 1, 5, and 21. Accordingly, the combination of Tjandrasuwita *et al.* and Hicok *et al.* do not make obvious claims 1-27. Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of such claims are respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 8-13, 15-20, and 24-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As claims 4, 8-13, 15-20, and 24-27, are directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claims 1, 5, and 21, which are now believed to be allowable per the aforementioned reasons, it is believed these claims are now also allowable. However, Applicant reserves the right to cast such claims into independent form at a later date, if necessary.

09/672,635

00AB148

III. Conclusion

The present application is believed to be condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731